

ANTI - SLAVERY REPORTER.

VOL. I.]

MAY, 1834.

[NO. 5.]

REVIEW OF A COLONIZATION ARTICLE IN "THE LITERARY AND THEOLOGICAL REVIEW," AND A DEFENCE OF ABOLITION.

Review of Anti-Slavery Publications and defence of the Colonization Society. By the HON. THEODORE FRELINGHUYSEN, Senator in the United States Congress.

That a distinguished champion of human rights, conspicuous for his able and eloquent defence of the Indians against the unconstitutional encroachments of Georgia avarice, should be found urging on the feelings of national intolerance against a portion of his own countrymen even more injured and oppressed than the Aborigines of our soil themselves, is truly cause of grief, if not of indignation.

We freely admit that the writer may think himself actuated by the principles of Christianity and benevolence, and though with the motives of an individual we may have little to do, yet upon great principles of action, upon results and facts, it is our undoubted right to be heard, especially in defence of principles, which however they may be stigmatized as "abstract," are of undeniable truth, and of such practical importance that our fathers hesitated not to stake their "lives, fortunes and sacred honor" in their vindication.

We are struck at once in reading the review with this remarkable concession "yielding to the opposers *all which they urge against the unchristian spirit that estranges from us our colored brethren,*" &c. and we wonder how the honorable gentleman after yielding so much would venture a conflict in which, to us it appears, the most important ground of all is in the outset conceded.

The most serious charge, this writer has made against the Anti-Slavery Declaration is that of enjoining political action. The implication contained in this charge we confess in our opinion not very creditable to the candor of its author. It is well known both from the professions of that Declaration, and from the character of the Abolitionists, that no idea of political elevation at all influences them; that their aims are solely moral and their measures only such as are employed by the advocates of the gospel of peace itself. But with what consistency the charge of political action can be cast upon abolitionists from this quarter, let the public decide. Since it is well known that the 2d article of the Constitution of the American Colonization Society contains this clause, "and the Society shall act to effect this object (the colonization of the free people of color,) *in co-operation with the general government, and such of the States as may adopt regulations upon the subject.*"

In order more fully to show the foundation of this charge, we transcribe from the Declaration the two sentences whose connexion is necessary to preserve the true sense of either, and one of which only the gentleman has chosen in order to establish his position; a position, which if established, would put us on precisely the ground assumed by the Colonization Society itself.

But we maintain that Congress has a right, and is solemnly bound, to suppress the domestic slave trade between the several States, and to abolish slavery in those portions of our territory which the Constitution has placed under its exclusive jurisdiction.

We also maintain that there are, at the present time, the highest obligations resting upon the people of the free States, to remove slavery by moral and political action, as prescribed in the Constitution of the United States.

With all due deference to the learning and sagacity of the gentleman, we beg to say that in the first paragraph the particular measures are referred to by which it is competent for Congress, according to the Constitution, to operate upon the great moral and political evil, viz. to interdict the execrable slave trade and to abolish slavery in those portions of the country exclusively under their jurisdiction—and in the second it is maintained that the duty of the people of the whole country is, to promote and support such action, both by moral means and by the constitutional exercise of their political rights.

Will not the American people exercise their political power for good or for evil on this and on every other subject, whether A. S. Societies exist or not? We presume the distinguished gentleman does not mean seriously to propose to the people the abdication of this right. And is it any thing but a moral measure for the A. S. Convention to recommend to their fellow citizens so to exercise their political and moral powers, as to discharge their own consciences of the sin of participating in this enormous iniquity? Now to us it appears quite an unworthy attempt, for this, to implicate A. S. Societies or Conventions in any political projects whatever. We cheerfully concede that a better system of public morals than slavery produces, would improve all our legislation, but this is no more an argument against Anti-Slavery principles and measures than similar results of the Temperance Reform is proof that the Amer. Tem. Society entertains a political project.

The reviewer exclaims, "What the political action is which the Constitution *prescribes* for the removal of slavery, we have yet to learn, nor is it easy to imagine a federal principle adequate to that result, and at the same time compatible with the "sovereignty of each state to legislate exclusively on the subject." Here the quotation from the Declaration is incomplete and its incompleteness perverts its meaning. The sentence reads thus, "We fully and unanimously recognize the sovereignty of each state to legislate exclusively on the subject of the slavery which is tolerated within its limits." Passing over the unfairness of

these quotations, it will be recollected that Congress according to the constitution, has power "to regulate commerce among the several states." And having exercised its power to abolish the accursed trade in human beings from without, by denouncing it as PIRACY, it certainly might, according to the express words of the Constitution so "regulate commerce among the several states," as to abolish all traffic in the bodies and souls of native Americans, throughout the Union. It is self-evident that the two measures of interdicting the brutal and revolting trade in human flesh between the states, and destroying slavery in the District and Territories under its control, constitute "the political action which the Constitution prescribes" as referred to in the Declaration. We are therefore at a loss to understand how such action of the General Government to abolish the iniquitous slave trade *between* the several states can at all interfere with "the sovereignty of each state to legislate on the subject of the slavery which is tolerated *within* its own limits." We have special reason to deny the right of any sovereign state to legislate beyond its own limits on this or any other subject.

Shame then that Congress should permit for one moment this accursed trade "among the several states," in native born men, women and children of America? Ever to be lamented that an eloquent Senator and pious man should employ his talents in mystifying this plain and righteous cause.

If it is PIRACY to trade in foreigners, it should be regarded as a higher crime to buy and sell native Americans. Yet the laws of the Union uphold this *piracy*. The power to abolish this nefarious trade is therefore "expressly warranted by the clear terms of the Constitution," and it is a gross error to say that "these terms do not in any case contemplate an inhibition of the transfer of slaves from one territory to another, in both of which slavery is recognized by law."

We confess ourselves horror-struck at this cold-blooded defence of slavery and the slave trade!

Again says the Review, "The first affirmative point in the conclusions at which the Convention arrive from their premises is, "That there is no difference in principle between the African slave trade and American slavery." By this it is obviously meant that it is as wicked for an American owner

of slaves to retain them, as it is to engage in the African slave trade."

In the Declaration of the Anti-Slavery Society the words *in principle* are in italics but are not printed as emphatic in the quotation. But we are astonished that any one should attempt to show that an identity of *principle* was the same thing as an identity in the degrees of crime. It is a palpable sophism. Indeed, if the Convention had said that American slavery was as bad as the African slave trade, there would have been sufficient defence of the charge in the fact that a single state (Virginia) sells annually to the farther south 6,000* *native victims*: violating all the holy ties of domestic life, masters selling their own sons and daughters, brothers and sisters, into hopeless and perpetual bondage. Is there any feature in the African slave trade as unearthly, as unspeakably revolting as this! We really think that the honorable Senator has become the advocate of a system in all respects *worse* than the proscribed slave trade itself. If in the dark corners of the earth it is piracy to steal or buy and transport human beings into bondage, how aggravated is the crime of perpetrating and perpetuating this enormous outrage *by law*, and all this in the full light of civilization and the gospel.

The article under consideration repeats the favorite pretexts and bugbears of the defenders of slavery. The necessity of "preparatory measures," such as "the cultivation of the intellect to obviate the recurrence of the scenes of St. Domingo." And pray what cultivation of the intellect can ever be afforded in slavery?

And how can a candid man seriously propose such a preparation for liberty, when with one accord all slave-holding legislatures make the instruction of slaves penal and in some states the second offence is punishable with death? As to St. Domingo we could not have supposed the gentleman so utterly unlearned in the history of occurrences "within the memory of this generation," or so unfair if informed, as to repeat the stale and often refuted slander against the negro, or rather against humanity itself, that the massacres in that Island were "the consequences of premature abolition." Be it remembered that it was the attempt to subjugate the free, and not the emancipation of the slave, which oc-

casioned the massacres of St. Domingo. As well might we regard the overthrow of Pharaoh and his hosts in the Red Sea, as "the consequence of premature abolition," as to make the same charge against a people who had been free six or seven years.

Is it not contrary to all the known laws of human action, for men who have peaceably submitted to be plundered of their labors, to be scourged, to be bought and sold like beasts, and to be robbed of their wives and their children; when emancipated from bondage, rewarded for their toil, made secure in the possession of their domestic relations, treated kindly, instructed in learning, religion and the useful arts, to become on this account suddenly full of turbulence and rebellion, of violence and massacre? The St. Domingo history proves directly the reverse of all this, and so does every other history of emancipation! Witness the half-million of free blacks among us—the most peaceable and inoffensive people in the world. Emancipation in Colombia, Mexico, and Guiana proves the same thing, as also the experience of the colony at the Cape of Good Hope.

We did anticipate from the pen of the New Jersey Senator something better than this *poetry of Colonization*.* Yet he fondly dotes on the effects of the Colony upon "the native tribes of Africa," "the fountains and streams of salvation" gushing from Liberian sands, while "the native tribes look on and wonder," and many other pretty poetical imaginings. For the truth of these representations, we turn to the unmannerly testimony of facts as recorded in the Af. Repos. The Rev. Mr. Pinney, missionary to Liberia, being on the spot and above all suspicion, by his letter dated Liberia, Feb. 20, 1833, completely overthrows this visionary fabric.

"The colonists are very ignorant of every thing about the interior: except of the tribes along the coast *nothing at all* is known, and of them little but their *manner of traffic*. *Nothing has been done for the natives*, hitherto, by the colonists, except to educate a few who were in their families in the *capacity of servants*. The *natives* are, as to wealth and intellectual cultivation, *related* to the colonists as the

* "The poetry of philanthropy" is the coinage of the Rev. Dr. Hawks. At a large Colonization meeting, he declared that the evils of slavery are but "the poetry of philanthropy," and boasted that "he had drawn his first nourishment at the South!" It was on this occasion, that the Hon. Mr. Frelinghuysen said that nine-tenths of these evils were imaginary. Mr. F. could not go the whole!

negro in America is to the *white man*—and this fact, added to their mode of dress, which consists of nothing usually but a handkerchief around the loins, leads to the SAME DISTINCTION as exists in America between *colors*. A colonist of any dye (and many there are of a darker hue than the Vey, or Dey, or Croo, or Bassoo,) would, if at all respectable, think himself *degraded* by marrying a native. The natives are in fact *mentals*—I mean those in town—and sorry am I to be obliged to say, that from my limited observation, it is evident, that *as little effort is made by the colonists to elevate them, as is usually made by the higher classes in the United States to better the condition of the lower*. Such I suppose will ever be the case, when men are not actuated by a pure desire to do good."

"It requires no great keenness of observation, to see the cause why the colony is not more prosperous. But two or three hitherto have done any thing scarcely towards agriculture. The *wealthy* find it easier to trade; the *poor* suppose it degrading."

"The native tribes" in the neighborhood of Liberia know little of the reviewer's visions. The Rev. Mr. Ashmun explains in some measure how they "look on and wonder," and gives a true picture of the influence of the Colony upon them. Describing an engagement he had with them, he says,

"Eight hundred men were here pressed shoulder to shoulder in so compact a form that a child might easily walk on their heads, from one end of the mass to the other, presenting in their rear a breadth of rank equal to 20 or 30 men, and all exposed to a gun of great power raised on a platform at only from 30 to 60 yards distance. Every shot literally spent its force in a solid mass of human flesh! The fire suddenly terminated. A savage yell was raised which filled the dismal forest with a momentary horror. It gradually died away and the whole host disappeared. At 8 o'clock the well known signal of their dispersion and return to their homes was sounded and many small parties were seen at a distance directly afterwards moving off in a different direction. One large canoe employed in reconveying a party across the Montserado, venturing within the range of the long gun, was struck by a shot and several men killed." Af. Rep. Vol. 2. page 179.

Very recently a merchant of Philadelphia at Liberia on a visit, came near falling a victim to the hostility of the natives—the boat in which he was, being pursued by a canoe manned with armed savages, he and his party only escaped in consequence of *shooting two of their pursuers*. Otherwise this gentleman and his company might have become very soon "the property" of the savages. From all these sources, and indeed from every other unprejudiced authority, we gather the information that the natives, while they have been awed by the arms have not been improved by the proximity of the Colony. Tens of thousands of spear-

pointed knives, brass blunderbusses, muskets, pistols, and rivers of intoxicating liquors have been poured into this devoted country by the regular trade of the Colony, as is proved by the advertisements in the *Liberia Herald*. The licentiousness of the colonists, and we have high colonization authority for saying the licentiousness of some, who should have been their guides in virtue is now so notorious, that it is perfectly monstrous to hear colonization melodies chaunted in their praise while we have the evidence of the missionary, the returning emigrant, and confessing and mutually accusing officers, of the universal demoralization which prevails there. "There is not moral energy enough in the colony," says the Rev. L. Bacon, "to replace a flag staff which has rotted away, and signals cannot be made to ships."

The Review, in order to urge the claims of colonization, makes an array of the names of several great men who are understood to be connected with the Society. But what evidence have we that they understood the *real project* with which they have thus unguardedly associated themselves? Clarkson Wilberforce, Cropper and Buxton, and in fine all the British philanthropists, were themselves at first thus misled, and at one time the Af. Rep. sung their praises and claimed the influence of their illustrious names. The slave trade itself, though now regarded as the greatest enormity in the history of crime, had in its origin the approbation of the great Cotton Mather.

"And holy men gave Scripture for the deed."

Campbell.

To us it is not a little astonishing to see the name of Bushrod Washington quoted here to give popularity to the scheme. A man, though the nephew of the Father of his Country, and President of the American Colonization Society, who was the impious owner of about 1,000 human beings whom he claimed as property. His name is familiar to our eye, as subscribed to advertisements of runaway slaves, offering large rewards for their apprehension. On a single occasion, (in his own words,) "a sale was made of 54 negroes" to Louisiana, and in defence of this execrable traffic, in which he had been employed, and for which his name had been held up to scorn by the *Baltimore Morning Chronicle*, (a southern print) Judge Washington used this lan-

* Obad. 14. Neither shouldst thou have stood in the crossway to cut off those of his that did escape. How shall we account for the inconsistency of this Rev. Gentleman.

guage—"I never heard a sigh or a complaint from the parents of the two most valuable servants I ever owned, that their sons had abandoned them and my service and sought new habitations in Northern States, where they now are." And here we have Bushrod Washington, Lafayette, Mills and Finley, in one discordant group to prop up by factitious influence the falling temple!

The pious and devoted Mills supported the Colonization scheme with a single view to missionary effort in Africa. He never contemplated the forcible separation of Americans on account of complexion. He hoped that "a few of the blacks of good character could be settled on the African coast," thus to introduce "civilization and religion among the barbarous tribes already there." His name cannot, with any fairness therefore, be referred to in support of a society which has transported "ship-loads of *cagabonds* coerced away as readily as if it had been done with a cart whip," and whose publications stigmatize our oppressed though respectable colored brethren as "nuisances," "a degraded caste," "dull as brutish beasts," and "vagabonds," &c. Nor did the pious Mills anticipate the flourishing trade which the colonial merchants have carried on in rum, and in the instruments of murder, constituting at present their chief commerce!

Lafayette has had just as much to do with approving this Society as Clarkson, for they have both been seduced into its support by being made to think it an Anti-Slavery Society.

The Rev. Dr. Finley, one of the earliest and warmest friends of this scheme, himself a native of a slave state, gives his motives in a letter to a friend published in the *Af. Rep.* page 2, of the 1st vol. In the highest exercise of charity we can only say, that in our opinion, such principles of action are of most questionable humanity. "Could they be sent back to Africa," says he, "a threefold benefit would arise. WE SHOULD BE CLEARED OF THEM, we should send to Africa a population partly civilized and Christianized for their benefit, and our blacks themselves would be put in a better situation."

All the impressions which the reviewer would make on the public mind, of the favorable influence of the colony upon the natives, has been contradicted by the information communicated to the managers at their late annual meeting at Washington,

as reported for the *N. Y. Observer* (a col. print.) and the *Evangelist*. We are constrained therefore to suppose that the review was written before its author attended that meeting, and we regret that we are not able to see in its publication so many weeks afterwards the evidence of that ingenuousness of character for which we have always regarded him. From the Report alluded to we find he was very anxious about its probable effect on the public.

"When the fact of our debt was first developed last night, (said Mr. F.) it made my heart feel sick, especially because it will be so effectively employed against us. * * * While we were holding ourselves out to the public as able to transport any number of emigrants for \$30 each, and that the colony was prosperous, the emigrants thriving and happy, these disclosures came upon us. In the midst too of our conflict with the Abolitionists, as well as in the midst of this triumph respecting the Colony, we have gone in debt in two years to the amount of \$40,000. I trust that when the Secretary comes to publish his report he will prepare a statement on this subject, so that the public may have what I apprehend will be a perfectly satisfactory explanation of this business."

The Review seems in general to content itself with simply denying what the Abolitionists have proved from the authorized journal of the Society, and in that journal the managers of the Colonization Society have underwritten *by the very act of publication, and sometimes by expressed approbation*, some of the most gross and impudent pro-slavery doctrines which have ever disgraced the annals of tyranny.

To consider slavery as a "monstrous incubus never sought, but imposed upon us," to call the oppressor "unfortunate," and to say not one word of sympathy in favor of poor bleeding humanity at home, suffering under the tyrant's scourge and the more cruel violation of those ties which notwithstanding slavery, bind together the tender relations of life, is to show a turpitude of principle and a moral apathy utterly inconceivable in an enlightened and noble mind. It proves how the sin of slaveholding obliterates from a nation that intuitive sense of the injustice of oppression, otherwise universal amongst men. Such language is only another, though a more subtle method of saying with an "unfortunate" ancient afflicted with this "entailed curse," "I know not the Lord; neither will I let Israel go."

It is a consideration of overwhelming power, that God has, in effect, added the title of liberator of the slave to the names of his glory, saying to Israel, "I am the Lord that

brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage."

When Moses sounded through Egypt the command of the Most High to let his oppressed people go, Pharaoh exclaimed, who is the Lord that I should obey his voice? And is not the present time the parallel of that? Is there no analogy between the answer of Pharaoh and the declaration of the Colonization Society with respect to emancipation, that "in the age of nations a century is but a day?" And is not the bold and honest confession of the Egyptian tyrant the more honorable? If a century of bondage is but a day in their eyes, 3,000 years are but a month! Thus would they postpone abolition indefinitely forever. Were your brother, your son, a daughter, or a wife thus suffering bonds, what would be your feelings in respect of every hour's delay? In contrast with the apostle's command that we "remember them that are in bonds as bound with them," how cold-blooded, how like mockery is the pretence that "in the age of nations a century is but a day." This sentiment would consign to hopeless slavery during the next century upwards of 100 millions of our slaves, and their descendants, every one of whom would die in slavery, in intellectual and moral darkness. And what is pretended in extenuation of this gradual scheme of indefinite postponement? An imaginary Expediency! But how blind is the expediency which would usurp the place of everlasting rectitude! Before the lapse of half a day of Colonization mercy, (viz. 50 years,) by the onward progress of population alone, it is more than probable that the just vengeance of offended heaven will cry to them, "Behold the hire of your laborers who have reaped your fields which is of you kept back by fraud, crieth and the cries of them which have reaped are entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth." And before 50 years it is certain that the whole southern region of our country will be in possession of the slaves unless we restore them their rights. This will result from the natural growth of slavery and the necessary emigration of the whites. But in case of war we cannot expect this event and its awful concomitants to be by any means as distant. Thus the boasted expediency of our adversaries shows the unsoundness of their political principles them-

selves, and throws a strong light on the perfect safety and expediency of immediate emancipation, by which in case of war two millions of people would become our defenders whom we are now wantonly rendering our enemies.

We are astonished to learn that "the great majority of the colonists are emancipated slaves, liberated by southern owners." This is undoubtedly incorrect—The African Repository speaks only of 3,000 colonists—more than that number have never gone there, and of this number 1,200 were Africans taken from slave ships captured on the ocean, and not "liberated by southern owners"—1,200 free people of color have been enticed or "coerced" away and there remains but 800 liberated slaves to complete the population of the colony. We are credibly informed by returning colonists that of this 3,000 persons not more than 1,700 are to be found, so that the colony has not increased but has actually suffered a diminution of 1,300 persons. Nor is this unlikely when we consider that by the confession of Rev. Mr. Gurley, the Secretary, that of the last 600 and odd emigrants 134 had died within 6 months, and very probably by this time the mortality is as great as 200. At any rate 20 per cent. in 6 months is a most horrible mortality, and no matter whether the expeditions were furnished with men enticed or "coerced," will not the blood of these poor fellow creatures be demanded at the hand of those concerned in their destruction? The mortality of the cholera in New-York in 1832 was sufficiently terrible, and yet amounted only to one and a half per cent. of the whole population; but what picture of death did that scourge present to be at all compared with the carnage of African Colonization!—During the last 6 months the mortality of 20 per cent. which prevailed was as if this city should lose 48,000 of its inhabitants. In the light of these facts how is it possible for us to desire or promote such emigration! "How or on what authority" the honorable writer could have declared that one half the colonists were slaves liberated by southern masters or could call Liberia "that happy community, now gratefully enjoying the fruits of this enterprise on the coast of Africa," "we have yet to learn." It is not, however, strange, with such facts as these before them, that the poor people of color should be in the habit

of calling the Colonization Society "that bloody institution."

There is entirely too much "kindred sympathy and cordial co-operation" with oppression in this composition of the U. S. Senator. It is indeed only necessary to read his paper to be convinced of the deadly nature of the Colonization leaven which can thus pervert the good and estrange the virtuous to be the defenders of oppression, and we can the more readily trace the identity of that influence which "hath leavened the whole lump." Nor are we surprised that such an influence should move the mass of profligacy and sin to aid "the benevolent objects of the Colonization Society" by physical force, by scurrilous abuse, by outrageous falsehood, and by mobs—when we see in the intelligent and pious such lamentable effects.

The very desire "to find common ground" with those who trade in sinews, is disgraceful in its own nature. We are not advocates of an impolitic, gratuitous and abusive manner, but we would rather be guilty of all this than find ourselves yielding high moral principles for the sake of harmony. Let us be *first* pure, then peaceable. We protest against any common ground from which our oppressed brethren are to be excluded.

The only common ground acknowledged, is that upon which *all* the inhabitants of this land ought to unite, namely, "Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so unto them." Now the uniform declaration of the colored people is that they are unwilling to leave this land in which they were born, where they have many dear attachments and where though they have been persecuted, they would rather live than to go to a barbarous and a deadly shore, shut out from the privileges of the gospel and deprived of the countenance, assistance and counsels of many disinterested and kind friends. They hope that the prejudice against them on account of color will be destroyed as Christians learn more and more to realize that God has made of one blood all the nations of men to dwell on the face of the whole earth. They feel confident that expatriation is impracticable, and they would rather suffer extermination than leave the land of their fathers, for whose liberty many of them fought both in the war of the revolution and in the last war, and received too the high-

est approbation of the present Chief Magistrate for their valor and patriotism. The single fact that colored Americans so love their country that they will not leave it, settles the whole question and renders it unnecessary to resort to other arguments, equally unanswerable.

A respectable colored man gave the following reason why he did not think he would be better off in Africa than in this country—That as they were Christians here and civilized men, and yet treated colored persons so badly as to wish them to leave the country of their birth, he was sure that the barbarous and heathen nations would be likely to be more cruel still, and instead of desiring them to emigrate to a foreign land would very likely drive them back into the sea, "to be cleared of them."

It seems almost idle to answer the often repeated assertion of the Colonizationists, that Maryland, Virginia, Kentucky, and Tennessee are becoming favorable to abolition: for there is not a particle of evidence that colonization influence which has for seventeen years prevailed among the people of these states has kindled in them the smallest interest in such guilty and "ill-judged measures." On the contrary, the argument of Mr. Cropper has never been answered, and perhaps never will be. We believe that if a change in favor of liberty can be proved to have taken place within the period of the existence of the Colonization Society, its advocates will not be backward to claim the honor of it. We too, cheerfully grant, that *whatever* change of feeling and opinion has taken place in the country, is very much if not entirely the effect of their principles, for during the last 17 years they have occupied "common ground" with the slaveholders, to the virtual exclusion of all genuine Abolitionists.

In the year 1790, says the venerable Mr. Cropper, there were 59,000 free blacks in America. Emancipation was then going on with considerable rapidity, and feelings were cherished then, similar to those entertained in South America, and various other places; so that in 1810, the number had augmented to 156,000. Had emancipation got on in the same ratio, the ensuing 20 years, there ought to have been 584,000 free blacks; but when the census of 1830 was made up, we found the number to be only 319,000; and, consequently, owing to some change of feeling in America, there are 265,000 negroes now left in slavery, who would otherwise have been set free. Now it is a singular fact, that during the last 20 years, the American Colonization Society has been in operation.

We therefore believe that the actual influence of this scheme has been in all respects unfavorable to the cause of human liberty.

We all know what arguments were brought against West India emancipation by the Duke of Wellington and his tory adherents, from the fact that the people of the United States regarded the blacks as inferior and destined to perpetual degradation. Is it not painful to see free America giving lessons on the necessity of political tyranny even to the inveterate tories and tyrants of Europe?

That the boasted law of Maryland (in favor of colonization) is calculated to drive colonization by force, or in other words, to expatriate the free by violence, and that the managers of the American Colonization Society are officially implicated in the cruelty of its provisions, we think the following evidence will fully show.

At the last meeting of the American Colonization Society, on motion of the Hon. Mr. Chambers, it was

Resolved, That the Society view, with the highest gratification, the continued efforts of the State of Maryland to accomplish her patriotic and benevolent system in regard to her colored population, and that the late appropriation by that State, of two hundred thousand dollars in aid of African colonization, is hailed by the friends of the system, as a bright example to other states.

In support of this resolution, Mr. C., among other things said,

"Sir, I reside in a slave State, alive to all the jealousies which a consideration of this kind must excite. No other state would be more sensitive at the slightest effort to withdraw from its own peculiar cognizance, the exclusive and entire control of all questions touching this species of property; none will go farther to sustain her right to such exclusive jurisdiction; and no citizen of the State would vindicate that claim with more untiring zeal and firmness, than the individual now before you. But, sir, the apprehension is groundless—your constitution avows, and your whole history proves that no such purpose exists. The Society interferes with the rights and interests of no one. Who has ever claimed for the Society or for the National Government, operating through its agency, the right to interfere with, or control State legislation on the subject of slavery? There may be individuals in this Society, as there are out of it, who intemperately urge the subject of emancipation, and would desire to see it advance quite beyond the limits of prudence and safety. Such enthusiasts may be willing to make any institution, society, or government, auxiliary to their wild and mischievous projects; but the Colonization Society, is not responsible for these intemperate fanatics: nor does it countenance or encourage their schemes:—It interferes in no way with the rights or the interests of owners of slaves. That in the prosecution of its legitimate operations, and by affording the prospect of comfort and respectability to the man of color, it may exert an influence altogether of a moral nature favorable to emancipation, with a view to colonization, may be admitted. It imposes no restraints, makes no demands, assails no man's rights, nor seeks to invade the volition which he indulges, or to disturb the enjoyment of what the laws secure to him. Its sole and single object is the colonization of the free, and with their full consent."

It will be plainly seen by the following extract from the Maryland Act, how the "full consent" of the "free" colored people is to be obtained. The most "benevolent" thing in the law appears to be this: it gives the slave the alternative of remaining in bond-

age if he does not consent to be an exile from his native land!

—"or in case the said person or persons shall refuse to be so removed, then it shall be the duty of the said board of managers to remove the said person or persons to such other place or places beyond the limits of this state, as the said board shall approve of, and the said person or persons shall be willing to go to, and to provide for their reception and support at such place or places as the said board may think necessary, until they shall be able to provide for themselves out of any money that may be earned by their hire, or may be otherwise provided for that purpose, and in case the said person or persons shall refuse to be removed to any place beyond the limits of this state, and shall persist in remaining therein, then it shall be the duty of the said board to inform the sheriff of the county wherein such person or persons may be, of such refusal, and it shall thereupon be the duty of the said sheriff forthwith to arrest or cause to be arrested the said person or persons so refusing to emigrate from this state, and transport the said person or persons beyond the limits of this state; and all slaves shall be capable of receiving manumission, for the purpose of removal as aforesaid, with their consent, of whatever age, any law to the contrary notwithstanding."

Virginia has either driven away or kidnapped and sold into slavery many of her free negroes, and the same malign influence, so active among these states has disgraced Ohio, and stained her statute book with laws passed to expel the unfortunate yet industrious and inoffensive colored people who had fled to her for protection. What infamy! for a Christian people thus to trample on distressed innocence. Besides the pusillanimity of the persecution, it violates the express injunction of God—"Thou shalt not deliver unto his master the servant which is escaped from his master unto thee: *He shall dwell with thee even among you in that place which he shall choose in one of thy gates, where it liketh him best: thou shalt not oppress him.*" Deut. xxiii: 15—16.—

The rapid progress of this desire to expatriate the colored people, has originated undeniably in the colonization scheme—It was never heard of before that project was set on foot.

The State of Connecticut, many of whose citizens are an ornament to human nature and the glory of our land, has become conspicuous for her legislation against the instruction of the colored people, and in the chivalrous war recently waged against a devoted and "glorious woman," for daring to teach poor females of the proscribed hue, certain eminent colonizationists, *worthy fellow citizens of Benedict Arnold*, have led the gallant assault.

It is not a little surprising that the Colonizationists think it undoubted that all the manumissions which have taken place dur-

ing the last 17 years are the legitimate results of their "benevolent operations," while they consider it quite certain that these cruel, disgraceful, and unconstitutional persecutions of the free colored citizens of this land unknown as they were until the colonization era, were the results of other causes and have no relation whatever to any influence exerted by that illustrious Institution.

It is a recorded fact that 300 poor free negroes principally women and children (or as the Sec. of the Col. Soc. elegantly expresses the idea, "families without their male heads") were transported to Liberia by the Managers of the Am. Col. Society, and who were yet "coerced away as truly as if it had been done with a CARTWHIP." One of these individuals, a man, declares that he was several times called out of his bed at midnight in Virginia for no other offence than

"The curl of his hair and the hue of his skin."

Whittier.

and suffered in all the infliction of 300 stripes with the cartwhip before he was made "willing" to leave what *he considered* his native land and all he held dear to go to a dark, inhospitable, and deadly shore.

"There is an immense aggregate of blame somewhere; and I want to find out where it belongs, and put it there. Two years ago, I warned the managers against this Virginia business. And yet they sent out two ship loads of VAGABONDS not fit to go to such a place, and that were COERCED away as truly as if it had been done with a CARTWHIP. Sir, we are not only embarrassed, but we are BROKEN." Speech of Rev. J. R. Breckinridge.

It is a fact that this honest and manly speech has been suppressed in the publication made in the African Repository of the proceedings at the annual meeting of the Colonization Society recently held at Washington.

"So I returned and considered all the oppressions that are done under the sun, and behold the tears of such as were oppressed and they had no comforter, and on the side of the oppressor there was power, and they had no comforter."

We regret to have to remark that the writer of the review has been betrayed by the spirit of Colonization into the use of all the epithets and the gross and unmerited abuse which characterize the tactics of his party. We will not hesitate to say boldly, while we particularly regret that the censure falls where it does that his

language is decidedly censurable as ungentlemanly and unkind. Was it argument, manners, Christian decorum, or even manliness, toward his adversaries in this discussion to use such epithets as the following;

"Downright madness,"

"Regardless of consequences,"

"Rash and dangerous spirit,"

"Threatens ruin and destruction,"

"Wild on rushing of fanaticism."

We can freely forgive Mr. F. for the public abuse of the Abolitionists which won him the applause of the thousands at the Colonization meeting at the Masonic Hall, but we suspect that it did not win him the peace of his own conscience. That gentleman well knew that the excitement which was got up on that occasion by the vilest press in this city or the land, had gone so far that dirks were drawn and pistols cocked to seek the heart's blood of men who had often sat with him at the table of their common Redeemer. Yet at this moment were terms of abuse poured forth from his mouth calculated to incense the already inflamed and ignorant multitude. Thus adding coals to the fire of a persecution which he may yet live to regret he did not strive to quench.

Oh! it is a bad augury when the sympathies are on the wrong side! It were better "to have allowed something to the spirit of liberty," than thus to have set on the dogs of persecution and lighted the flames of discord, against brethren!

But the holy cause of liberty is worth the contest. Let none join the battle of the free whose hearts do not welcome the shock. It is the cause of God—it is the sacrifice of the Highest—"to undo the heavy burdens, to let the oppressed go free, and to break every yoke." The consciences of men are with us, the indications of Divine Providence are favorable, the cause is onward. The Declaration of Independence furnishes us our "abstractions."—The word of God teaches us our duties, marks out our paths, and puts the words into our mouths, "Let my people go." The Constitution of our Union is framed with a view to liberty and not to slavery, and the hearts of freemen cannot forever slumber over the wrongs of the bleeding, the destitute and the oppressed.

Indeed we are disposed to entreat our "respected friends" the Colonizationists

no longer "to stand in the breach for the slaveholder to keep off the Abolitionists,"* but take the great lesson on "abstract rights" which the word of God teaches, the voice of conscience reiterates, and which the thunders of Divine vengeance will yet vindicate, unless we repent and forsake our sins.

We rejoice at the protestation of the Reviewer, that if the Colonization Society "soothed the conscience of the slaveholder and contented him in the enjoyment of slaves as property," he would be among the first to forsake it. While we have great confidence in the sincerity of this declaration, we are not disposed to admit that the gentleman is altogether an unprejudiced judge. He is to some extent committed. All his writings and speeches on the subject betray a spirit of excited personal feeling amounting even to intolerance which indicates too strong an interest in the cause of the Society, to favor a dispassionate and sound judgment. The native of a slave state, and having for a number of years been accustomed to occupy "common ground" with the slaveholder, we sincerely think that it is expecting too much of humanity to anticipate from this gentleman a perfectly unprejudiced mind.

If, however, we shall succeed in establishing the charge that the American Colonization Society "soothes the conscience of the slaveholder, &c." we call on the magnanimity of the New-Jersey Senator, for the sake of the most holy cause of freedom, to make the sacrifice of his personal feelings and to put the weight of his name and character, his talents and his purse on the side of bleeding humanity. Instead of saying that "nine-tenths of the evils of slavery are imaginary," a sentiment highly derogatory to a Christian and a republican, and untrue in fact, let his voice ring through the halls of his country's legislature and jurisprudence, with the praises of liberty and the high duties and destinies of American Christians.

Abolitionists in general regard the person more highly and more kindly than they do the sentiments of this eminent individual. They do not charge him with *intending* a conspiracy against the poor and needy, but they do believe him to have been

misled by the craftiness and double intentions of men of a different spirit from himself. Let him not, however, regard these concessions to his motives as an attempt to fawn upon his person or to compromise the glorious and heavenly principles of Abolition. The truth is immutable! if we are not on that rock—it will not be moved for our convenience—if we are there, we will in *principles* be uncompromising.—Truth holds no parley with error, nor can she. But while *uncompromising* in principle we desire to be *courteous in manner*. Our aim has been not to be overawed by greatness, by influence, or by talents, but to speak the truth in love. Relying with unaffected and unshaken confidence on the word of God, we wait with happy anticipations its destined triumph. We have aimed not to return railing for railing while we have attempted fearlessly to discuss principles most dear to our hearts. With what success we shall not however presume to judge.

While we hope that the evidence already laid before the public, and the facts constantly developing which can be no longer so ungraciously attributed to slander, may turn the minds of all good men in the Colonization cause we fear that party spirit and self-love may deter many from the manly acknowledgement of error—the ingenuousness of honorable confession. We have indeed sometimes thought that some persons whom we regard as good men, when actuated by party spirit and pride of opinion, would rather fight against God than publicly to confess an error or abandon a wrong enterprise once undertaken.

The African Repository and Colonial Journal, published by order of the Managers of the American Colonization Society, is the only source from which we desire the privilege of bringing our proofs. The Repository contains the addresses of auxiliaries, the speeches of distinguished members, editorial notices, and original matters. But that the chief moral influence of the Journal resides in the speeches, we have no hesitation whatever to declare. If the speeches exert no moral influence why are they published? If they do, the publishers are liable for the character of that influence. The correctness of this principle they have practically acknowledged by accompanying the publication of an abolitionist member with a disclaimer

* Rev. Mr. Breckinridge's col. speech.

of its doctrines; and by actually suppressing the publication of abolition speeches, while their open and ready page is unhesitatingly and unblushingly given to the defenders of oppression. To what end do they protest that they are not liable for the opinions of individual members! No one ever held them so. But they *are* liable for what they publish, be it what it may, no matter who its author is. The very apology is a tacit admission that their publications are of evil tendency. While they profess to be a benevolent society and the friends of the black man, they print and circulate vilifications of his character, call him a "vagabond," "dull as a brutish beast," "abandoned," and "a nuisance." Blessed be the God of the oppressed—their defender is mighty, and he hears the groans of the poor, and will avenge them who are trodden under foot.

Suppose the "Literary and Theological Review," for instance, to publish this very article, would the hon. Senator hold it irresponsible? Surely not,—and therefore its Editor has already refused to admit any thing in answer to the Reviewer. Or suppose it to publish the vile tirades of Atheists against Christianity for the sake of finding "common ground" with these enemies of God, and then hold itself irresponsible, saying that it was a matter of individual opinion only—the writer solely accountable, would not the common sense of men protest against them as false or mad? Hear then the proofs!—

"Slavery is an evil entailed upon the slave holders which they must suffer whether they will or not." Af. Rep. vol. v. p. 179.

"There is no ground for fear on the part of our southern friends, we hold their slaves as we hold their other property, SACRED. Let not this slander be repeated." Af. Rep. vol. 1, p. 283.

But now Abolitionists are slandered for charging them on their own authority with soothing the conscience of the slaveholder by calling the wrongs which they inflict on the helpless, rights. "Wo unto them that call evil good and good evil; that put darkness for light and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet and sweet for bitter!"

"And the slave holder so far from having just cause to complain of the colonization society has reason to congratulate himself that in this institution a channel is opened up in which the public feeling and public action can flow on without doing violence to his rights. The closing of this channel might be calamitous to the slave holder

beyond his conceptions, for the stream of benevolence which now flows so innocently in it might then break out in forms even far more disastrous than Abolition Societies and all their kindred and ill-judged measures." Af. Rep. vol. vi. p. 363.

"To the slave holder who had charged upon them the wicked design of interfering with the rights of property under the specious pretext of removing a vicious and dangerous free population, they address themselves in a tone of conciliation and sympathy. We know your rights, say they, and we respect them." Af. Rep. vol. vii. p. 100.

These publications speaking to the slaveholder in tones of "sympathy and conciliation," and acknowledging the right "of enacting iniquity by law," of retaining in bondage men originally stolen, plundering the laborer of his hire, of carrying on the nefarious trade "in the bodies and souls of men," *aye*, and holding these rights "SACRED," without doubt must tend to quiet the conscience of the oppressor and to perpetuate oppression.

Thus to denounce as "ill-judged" abolition societies and their measures, to call God's oppressed people vagabonds and nuisances, to declare beings purchased by the blood of Christ, property, while professing to be their friends, to consider slavery a curse entailed upon the master "which he must suffer whether he will or not," to fawn on the haughty tyrant, to pander to his base passions, is not this enough to disgust any human being with their professions of benevolence? Is it not enough to establish beyond dispute that the tendency of the American Colonization Society "is to soothe the conscience of the slaveholder, to content him with the enjoyment of slaves as property, and thus to retard the advance of free principles?"

We pray God that one like the writer of the review whose very instincts have heretofore always been on the side of virtue and holiness may be saved from the ruin and infamy of this moral whirlpool, whose outer eddies, though serene as the undimpled lake, conduct only to the more certain ruin the hapless bark that trusts its deceitful edge. A Society of whose principles we must be permitted to exclaim, "O my soul come not thou into their secret; unto their assembly mine honor be not thou united!" A. L. C.

New-York, April 9, 1834.

THE AMERICAN SLAVE-TRADE.

We have heard it stated that about 2,000 slaves are to be sold in New-Orleans dur-

ing the present month! Yet good people celebrate the abolition of the slave-trade, and flatter themselves that slavery is dying away quite as fast as is, on the whole, desirable!—*Emancipator*.

We extract the following from the spirited preamble of the Constitution of the Anti-Slavery Society of Lane Seminary. The whole should appear if our limits would permit.

PREAMBLE TO THE CONSTITUTION
OF THE ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY
OF LANE SEMINARY.

Believing it incumbent upon all, who associate for the advancement of the general good, to state explicitly their *object*, their *reasons* for seeking it, the *means* proposed for its accomplishment, and the *principles* which are to control their action; we make the following exposition.

I. *Object*. Our object is the immediate emancipation of the whole colored race, within the United States; the emancipation of the slave from the oppression of the master, the emancipation of the free colored man from the oppression of public sentiment, and the elevation of both to an intellectual, moral, and political equality with the whites.

II. *Reasons*. We advocate the immediate emancipation of the slaves for the following reasons.

1. He is constituted, by God, a moral agent, the keeper of his own happiness, the executive of his own powers, the accountable arbiter of his own choice; personal ownership, his birth-right, unforfeited and inalienable; liberty and the pursuit of happiness, chartered rights, inherited from his Maker and guaranteed by all the laws of his being.

Slavery robs him of himself, body and soul; and though he is immortal, created in God's image, the purchase of a Savior's blood, visited by the Holy Ghost, and invited to citizenship with angels, and to fellowship with God, it drags him to the shambles, and sells him like a beast; goads him to incessant and unrequited toil—withdraws from him legal protection in all his personal rights and social relations, and abandons to caprice, cupidity, passion, and lust all that is dear in human well-being. It crushes the upward tendencies of intellect, makes the acquisition of knowledge a crime, and consigns the mind to famine.

It stifles the moral affections; represses the innate longings of the spirit, paralyzes conscience, turns hope to despair, and kills the soul.

As a system, slavery annihilates the marriage relation, exposes to pollution a million of fe-

males, and makes stripes or death the penalty of resistance. It tears asunder parents and children, husbands and wives, sisters and brothers, and consigns them to distant and hopeless bondage—desolate and heart-broken.

2. It excites the enmity of the oppressed against the oppressors, goads to desperation and revenge, provokes insurrection, and perils public safety.

3. It tends to blunt the sensibilities of all who exercise authority over the slave, and to transform them into tyrants. The whole process is drawn to the life by President Jefferson, who lived and died a slave-holder.

"The parent storms; the child looks on, catches the lineaments of wrath, puts on the same airs in the circle of smaller slaves, gives loose to the worst of passions, and thus nursed, educated, and daily exercised in tyranny, cannot fail to be stamped with odious peculiarities. The man must be a prodigy, who can retain his morals and manners undepraved in such circumstances."

4. It is the occasion of deep moral pollution to the families of slave-holders—a pollution mingling with the first thoughts, spreading wider and wider with the increase of years, and naturally resulting from contact with those whom legalized oppression renders liable to prostitution.

5. It cripples the energies of the whole nation, entails poverty and decay upon the states which uphold it, foment division and alienation in our public councils, and puts in jeopardy the existence of the union.

6. It is opposed to the genius of our government, makes our constitution a mockery, converts our national declaration into a rhapsody of sentimentalism, convicts us of hypocrisy at the bar of the world, neutralizes the power of our example as a nation, and checks the progress of republican principles.

7. It opposes an insuperable barrier to the conversion of the world, is a standing libel upon the avowed influence of the Christian religion, and heathen nations will not be slow to read the disgraceful commentary. It sanctions as a principle, the absurd and wicked prejudice against color; and thus not only dooms to despair the unfortunate millions of colored people in our own country, but would, if carried out, paralyze all missionary effort, and shut the bowels of mercy forever against the world.

8. Slavery exposes the nation to the judgments of God. We adopt and reiterate the memorable sentiment of Jefferson: "I tremble when I reflect that God is just, and that his justice cannot sleep forever;" and we urge an immediate repentance of the sin which provokes his wrath, and an immediate breaking off from it by righteousness.

We advocate the emancipation of the free colored man from the oppression of public sentiment and civil disabilities:

Because color, condition of birth, poverty,

calamity, and complicated wo, deserve no punishment. It is the part of a tyrant to inflict penalties upon the innocent; and when the victim is powerless, friendless, long-oppressed, and already heart-broken, it is the part of a fiend. The colored race in this country are the objects of scorn and persecution. Impoverished, disfranchised, and trodden into the dust, they faint under the inflictions of a public sentiment, "which exalteth itself above all that is called God."

We cannot hold our peace, while these, our brethren, are immolated upon the altar of prejudice and pride. They need our sympathies and our aid, *and they shall have them.*

We repudiate the doctrine that they cannot be elevated in this country. We believe they *can* be elevated, we believe they *will* be, and that "their redemption draweth nigh."

We invite public attention to the following letter from a student in the Lane Theological Seminary, recently published in the Western Recorder. Humanity sleeps over the wrongs of TWO MILLIONS OF STOLEN MEN, because the FACTS are hid. We hear not the slaves, because they are *slaves*!—And the smooth tongue of the manstealer—the wealthy, polite, and *generous* manstealer—has silvered over the abominable system till we, gentle and easy souls, suppose its horrors are "*imaginary*."—Let us peruse and weigh these penitential confessions.

LANE SEMINARY, MARCH 6, 1834.

MR. EDITOR—We have just closed one of the most interesting debates that I have ever attended. For eighteen evenings we have discussed the subject of abolition and colonization; and what is very remarkable, not the least unkind or even unpleasant feeling has been excited. There has been no shuffling, no quibbling, no striving to evade the truth; but, on the other hand, candor, fairness and manhood, have characterized the whole debate. Every argument has been fairly weighed; every objection duly considered. Neither side finds any fault with the other. All are satisfied that justice has been done.

The subject was divided into two questions. First—Ought the people of the slave-holding states to abolish slavery immediately?

Second—Are the doctrines, tendencies and measures of the American Colonization Society, and the influence of its principal supporters, such as to render it worthy of the patronage of the Christian public?

The speakers were from Virginia, Alabama, Kentucky, Louisiana, Arkansas Territory, Ohio,

Pennsylvania, New-York and Connecticut; most of them the sons of slave-holders.

The debate was opened by Mr. —, of Alabama. He commenced by asking this question—"What is slavery?" "Before we can prescribe a remedy," said he, "we must understand the disease. We must know what we are attempting to cure before we give the medicine." I was rejoiced to hear such a beginning from the son of a slave-holder; for I had longed to learn the true condition of the slave. And I had no doubt but that the feeling of the abolitionists on the subject of slavery, "was the poetry of philanthropy,"* and that "nine-tenths of the horrors of slavery were imaginary."†

Mr. — proceeded to give us facts illustrating slavery, and its effects on the social and political relations; facts illustrating the kind disposition of the slaves, and their gratitude for favors. He ridiculed the idea of its being dangerous to emancipate them immediately; then referred us to facts in point, and closed by giving us his hearty assent to the doctrines of immediate emancipation, as defined by the Emancipator, viz:—

"By immediate emancipation, we do not mean, that the slaves shall be turned loose upon the nation, to roam as vagabonds or aliens; nor, that they shall be instantly invested with all political rights and privileges; nor, that they shall be expelled from their native clime, as the price and condition of their freedom. But we mean, that instead of being under the unlimited control of a few irresponsible masters, they shall really receive the protection of law: That the power which is now vested in every slave-holder to rob them of their just dues, to drive them into the fields like beasts, to lacerate their bodies, to sell the husband from the wife, the wife from the husband, and children from their parents, shall instantly cease: That the slaves shall be employed as free laborers, fairly compensated, and protected in their earnings: That they shall be placed under a benevolent and disinterested supervision, which shall secure to them the right to obtain secular and religious knowledge, to worship God according to the dictates of their consciences, to accumulate wealth, and to seek an intellectual and moral elevation."

He occupied nearly three evenings. When speaking of the cruelties practised upon the slave, he said—"At our house it is so common to hear their screams from a neighboring plantation, that we think nothing of it. The overseer of this plantation told me one day, he laid a young woman over a log, and beat her so severely that she was soon after delivered of a dead child. A bricklayer, a neighbor of ours, owned a very smart young negro man, who

* Rev. Dr. Hawks.

† Hon. T. Frelinghuysen, at the New-York Colonization meeting.

ran away; but was caught. When his master got him home, he stripped him naked, tied him up by his hands, in plain sight and hearing of the academy and the public green, so high that his feet could not touch the ground; then tied them together, and put a long board between his legs to keep him steady. After preparing him in this way, he took a paddle, bored it full of holes, and commenced beating him with it. He continued it leisurely all day. At night his flesh was literally pounded to a jelly. It was two weeks before he was able to walk. No one took any notice of it. No one thought any wrong was done."

He stated many more facts of a similar kind. It will be recollected that he was attempting to give a fair *expose* of slavery. "And (said he) lest any one should think that *in general* the slaves are well treated, and these are the exceptions, let me be distinctly understood:—*Cruelty is the rule, and kindness the exception.*"

This was assented to and corroborated by all from the slave-holding states. And to show its truth, I will here introduce a few facts, as related by individuals from different parts of the country.

Mr. —, from Kentucky, who came here a colonizationist and a slave-holder, but has since turned abolitionist and emancipated his slaves, said—"Cruelties are so common, I hardly know what to relate. But one fact occurs to me just at this time that happened in the village where I live. The circumstances are these. A colored man, a slave, ran away. As he was crossing Kentucky river, a white man, who suspected him, attempted to stop him. The negro resisted. The white man procured help, and finally succeeded in securing him. He then wreaked his vengeance on him for resisting—flogging him till he was not able to walk. They then put him on a horse, and came on with him ten miles to Nicholasville. When they entered the village, it was noticed that he sat upon his horse like a drunken man. It was a very hot day; and whilst they were taking some refreshment, the negro sat down upon the ground under the shade. When they ordered him to go, he made several efforts before he could get up; and when he attempted to mount the horse, his strength was entirely insufficient. One of the men struck him, and with an oath ordered him to get on the horse without any more fuss. The negro staggered back a few steps, fell down, and died. I do not know as any notice was ever taken of it."

Mr. —, of Virginia, amongst others, related the following:—"I frequently saw the mistress of the family beat the woman who performed the kitchen work, with a stick two feet and a half long, and nearly as thick as my wrist; striking her over the head, and across the small of the back, as she was bent over at her work, with as much spite as you would a snake, and for what I should consider no offence at all. There lived in this same family a young

man, a slave, who was in the habit of running away. He returned one time after a week's absence. The master took him into the barn, stripped him entirely naked, tied him up by his hands so high that he could not reach the floor, tied his feet together, and put a small rail between his legs, so that he could not avoid the blows, and commenced whipping him. He told me that he gave him five hundred lashes. At any rate, he was covered with wounds from head to foot. Not a place as big as my hand but what was cut. Such things as these are perfectly common all over Virginia; at least so far as I am acquainted. Generally, planters avoid punishing their slaves before strangers."

Mr. —, of Missouri, amongst others, related the following:—"A young woman who was generally very badly treated, after receiving a more severe whipping than usual, ran away. In a few days she came back, and was sent into the field to work. At this time the garment next her skin was stiff like a scab, from the running of the sores made by the whipping. Towards night, she told her master that she was sick, and wished to go to the house. She went; and as soon as she reached it laid down on the floor exhausted. The mistress asked her what the matter was? She made no reply. She asked again; but received no answer. 'I'll see,' said she, 'if I can't make you speak.' So taking the tongs, she heated them red hot, and put them upon the bottoms of her feet; then upon her legs and body; and, finally, in a rage, took hold of her throat. This had the desired effect. The poor girl faintly whispered, 'Oh, misse, don't—I am most gone;' and expired."

We want no other commentary on the state of feeling in that community than this. The woman yet lives there, and owns slaves.

I am aware that it will be said, this is not a fair picture of slavery. But, sir, if I can judge from the conversation of gentlemen who have lived and been brought up amongst it, or from the testimony of respectable emancipated negroes, I know the picture has never yet been presented to the public, in all its ugliness. Such facts as *these* are as common to them as household affairs; and so common are they in the community where they occur, that little notice is taken of them. They produce no effect upon the public heart. They enlist no sympathy. They call up no pity. I do not mean to say, that every individual slave-holder treats his slaves cruelly. I know that there are exceptions. But it will be readily admitted by all, that the system of slavery tolerates it, and that the slave has no security, and can have no redress.

But to be short. As the debate progressed, objection after objection was cleared up; argument after argument overthrown; and on the ninth evening, when the question was taken, every individual who had heard the debate voted in the affirmative, except three or four from non-slave-holding states, who declined voting.

After listening nine evenings to this discussion, and most of the time to those who were from the bosom of slavery, and who understood well its genius, I was irresistibly driven to this conclusion:—That there is no subject before the American people, so little understood at the north, as the subject of slavery—particularly its horrors, its miseries, and its cruelties. These are not dreamed of there. And so much pains has been taken to varnish over the truth, that the general impression is, that the slave is better off than the free black. An opinion more inconsistent with truth could not well be entertained.

Another equally erroneous and as generally received opinion is, that the slaves could not take care of themselves, if they were set free. As fact is better than theory to answer such an objection, I will here state one as related by Mr. —, of Virginia. "Several years ago," said he, "I knew a slave who bought himself, and paid twelve hundred dollars. Some time after this, when coming up from Lynchburg, I happened to stay at the same place with this colored man. I found on inquiry, that by his industry and honesty he had secured quite a respectable property; that he was then driving a team of five horses, that belonged to himself; and that he was esteemed and employed as much as any man in the town in his line of business."

This is not a solitary case. Many of a similar kind have come under my own observation. I am acquainted with nearly fifty colored gentlemen in the city of Cincinnati, who have paid from \$200 to \$1200 for themselves or families, and are now living in a style that would not disgrace any man. They are as honest, as upright, and as industrious, as any community of men with whom I am acquainted. Beside, it may be safely said, that two-thirds of the colored families in this city are laying up money to buy their friends who are in slavery.

But suppose the slaves cannot take care of themselves, if set free; what is the argument? Is it perpetual servitude? If not, then slavery is the school to prepare them for freedom, and their masters and overseers are the tutors. And pray how long will it be before they can graduate with all the honors and learning that can be obtained in such an institution? Will another century roll away, and find them still incompetent? No doubt it will, sir; for their tutors, kind souls! are quite unwilling to crowd them in their studies. But, Mr. Editor, what distinguishes our happy country from heathen lands? Is it not our Christian, our benevolent and our charitable institutions? Is it not, that for our unfortunate deaf and dumb we have asylums? for our halt and lame and sick and insane we have hospitals? for our poor and helpless we have alms-houses? What provision, then, should be made for our more unfortunate and doubly miserable colored brethren, who have not mind enough to take care of themselves,

and whose very weakness and ignorance render them still more the objects of our pity? What provision has been made? O, tell it not in Gath—America has provided for her poor and powerless, chains and slavery!

The second question was also debated nine evenings; and when the ayes and nays were taken, only *one* said aye, and he was from a non-slave-holding state. It is hardly necessary for me to add, though it is a part of the object for which I write, that I have altered my opinion both in regard to the Abolition and Colonization Societies. And as I have a large number of friends who take your paper, and in it have seen my endorsement to the colonization scheme, as President of the Colonization Society of Oneida Institute, and who know that I have talked upon the subject both in public and in private; and that I have written letters to promote its interests, and given and begged money to help forward its operations; I wish them to know that I disclaim all connection with it; that I believe its doctrines, tendencies and measures are calculated to subvert the best interests of the colored people, to strengthen prejudice, to quiet the conscience of the slave-holder, and put far off the day of emancipation. I can abundantly prove all this, and much more. But the length of this communication forbids. I will only state one or two facts, illustrating the effects of the two societies.

Conversing with a slave holder a few weeks since, he said—"I *always* knew that slavery was wrong in the abstract; but I think it is right under existing circumstances. At any rate the Colonization Society says so; and its agents preach it where I live; and all my neighbors believe it. We all belong to the Society, and give money to it. I have regularly given ten dollars per year to help remove slavery."

So far his views were formed by colonization influence; and no doubt he was truly benevolent in giving his money to remove slavery in this way; for he thought it was the only way. He says now, "That the \$10 a year which I gave to the Colonization Society, was but a quietus to my conscience; and I thought I had a right to hold slaves indefinitely. But I find that the *blacks* have *rights*, as well as the *whites*, and we are invading them. I can give no more money to the Colonization Society, for I believe it is doing a vast deal of harm."

One individual, a student, came here a slave-holder and a colonizationist. He depended upon his slaves for support while obtaining his education. But as soon as he was convinced that it was wrong to hold slaves *under existing circumstances*, he went home and set them all free, and put them in a course of education, and now applies all their wages to their own benefit. This fact, politic, wise, and benevolent, develops the principles of abolition, and exhibits the genuine philanthropy of the system of immediate emancipation. Your's, &c.

AUGUSTUS WATTLES.

✍ We are much gratified to be able to lay before the readers of the Reporter, the following interesting communication. Who would believe that a serious attempt is now making to deprive every alleged fugitive from slavery, arrested in this state, of a TRIAL BY JURY? Such is the fact. $\frac{1}{2}$

Bedford, N. Y. 19th April, 1834.

Dear Sir—Incessant occupation since I returned from New-York, has prevented me from complying before this, with your request to furnish you with certain particulars relative to slavery in the District of Columbia. In the enclosed paper, you will find some interesting facts. With much respect, I remain your obedient servant,

WILLIAM JAY.

Elizur Wright, Jr.

FACTS RELATIVE TO SLAVERY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

On the 1st August, 1826, a notice appeared in the National Intelligencer at Washington, from the Marshall of the D. of C., that a negro named Gilbert Horton, and claiming to be free, had been committed to jail in Washington city as a runaway, and unless his owner proved property, and took him away by a certain time, the negro would be sold "*for his jail fees and other expenses, as the law directs.*" Horton was a native of Westchester Co. N. Y., and known there to be free. A public meeting of the inhabitants of the county was called, to take measures for his liberation. The meeting was held 30th August, 1826, and a series of resolutions were unanimously adopted; one of them calling on the Governor to demand the instant liberation of Horton as a *free citizen* of the State of New-York. Two of the resolutions were as follows:

"Resolved, That the law under which Horton has been imprisoned, and by which a free citizen without evidence of crime, and without trial by jury, may be condemned to servitude for life, is repugnant to our republican institutions, and revolting to justice and humanity; and that the representatives from this State in Congress are requested to use their endeavors to procure its repeal."

"Resolved, That a committee be appointed to prepare and present to the citizens of this county for their signatures, a petition to Congress for the immediate abolition of Slavery in the District of Columbia."

Governor De Witt Clinton in compliance with the request of the meeting, wrote to the President of the United States, forwarding evidence of Horton's freedom, and requiring his immediate liberation "as a free man and a citizen." Horton was released before the receipt of the Governor's letter. The Westchester petition was signed by 800, and presented to the House of Representatives.

In Dec. 1826, Mr. Ward, representative in Congress from Westchester, introduced a resolution calling on the committee for the D. of C. to inquire whether there was any law in the district authorizing the imprisonment of a free person of color, and his sale as an unclaimed slave for his *jail fees*. The resolution was adopted after much opposition by the Southern members. The committee reported that there *was such a law*, vindicated its general policy, but recommended that when the arrested negro was unclaimed he should not be sold, but that the county should pay the cost of imprisonment. The people of Georgetown presented a remonstrance against this proposition of the committee. The law remained unchanged, and so remains, it is believed, to this day.

On the 12th Feb. 1827, Mr. Nelson, of the New-York Senate, introduced the following resolutions, which were referred to the committee of the whole, but were not finally acted upon.

"Resolved, As the sense of this legislature, (if the assembly concur therein,) that the existence of slavery at the seat of the government of the U. States, and in a district under its exclusive control, is derogatory to the national character, and inconsistent with the great principles of liberty, justice and humanity, on which the institutions of our republic are founded."

"Resolved, That in the opinion of this legislature,

Congress ought to take such measures as in their wisdom may be deemed advisable for the final abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, and for the immediate prohibition of the further introduction of slaves into that District."

"Resolved, That his excellency the Governor, be requested to transmit a copy of these resolutions to the President of the United States, and to each of the senators and representatives in Congress from this State."

On the 27th March, 1827, a petition was presented to Congress from 1,000 citizens of the D. of C., praying for a revival of the slave laws, and an act declaring that all children of slaves to be born in the District after the 4th July, 1828, should be free at the age of 25, and that the importation of slaves into the District might be prohibited. From this petition, the following is an extract: viz.

"A colored man last summer, who stated that he was entitled to freedom, was taken up as a runaway slave and lodged within the jail of Washington city. He was advertised, but no one appearing to claim him, he was according to law put up at public auction for payment of his jail fees, and sold as a slave for life! He was purchased by a slave trader, who was not required to give security for his remaining in the District, and he was soon after shipped from Alexandria for one of the southern states. Thus was a human being sold into perpetual bondage, at the capital of the freest government on earth, without even a pretence of a trial, or the allegation of a crime."

In 1828, both houses of the Pennsylvania Legislature passed the following resolution by an almost unanimous vote: viz.

"Resolved, That the Senators of this state, in the Senate of the United States, are hereby requested to procure, if practicable, the passage of a law to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, in such a manner as they may consider consistent with the rights of individuals and the Constitution of the United States."

On the 9th Jan. 1829, the House of Representatives

"Resolved, That the committee for the District of Columbia, be instructed to inquire into the expediency of providing by law for the gradual abolition of slavery in the District, in such manner that no individual shall be injured thereby." Ayes 141—Noes 59.

On the 25th Jan. 1829, a committee of the N. York Assembly, to whom had been referred various memorials relating to slavery in the District of Columbia, made a report, in which they remarked, "Your committee cannot but view with astonishment, that in the capital of this free and enlightened country, laws should exist, by which the free citizens of a state are liable, even without trial, and even without the imputation of a crime, to be seized while prosecuting their lawful business, immured in prison, and though free, unless claimed as a slave, to be sold as such for the payment of jail fees." The committee recommended the following resolution: viz.

"Resolved, (if the Senate concur herein,) That the senators of this state, in the Congress of the United States be, and are hereby instructed, and the Representatives of this state are requested, to make every possible exertion to effect the passage of a law for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia. The resolution passed the Assembly but was not acted upon in the Senate.

In 1831, the corporation of Georgetown passed a law making it penal for a free negro to receive from the Post-office, have in his possession, or circulate, any publication or writing of whatever description, of a seditious character, and particularly the newspaper called the Liberator, published at Boston. The punishment for each offence to be a fine not exceeding \$20, or imprisonment for not more than 30 days. In case of inability to pay the fine and prison fees, the offender to be sold as a servant for four months.

